

which *was* intentional, of all hymns containing prayers to Christ, to which he objects on "scriptural and apostolical grounds." Can this man still act as the minister of a body, of whose meetings one of the earliest records is, that they sang a hymn to Christ as God? which thus addresses Him in her glorious hymn of praise, "We pray Thee help Thy servants, whom Thou has redeemed with Thy precious blood," and in another hymn in her most solemn service uses these words, "O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us?" Is it possible that he can celebrate the Holy Communion, and dare to use this language, if he does not believe it to be justifiable? If he denies the propriety of such prayers, if he could not say with the proto-martyr, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit," is it not evident that he has abandoned the faith of the Church? And yet this man retains his position by force, relying upon the authority of the highest court of appeal, under the protection of the Crown, by which the action of the Church has thus far been paralysed.

Surely then we should thank God, that He has raised up men who do not fear boldly to assert, and act upon, the inalienable right, and the unquestionable duty, of the Church of Christ, to purge itself from such a foul stain, and that He has placed in the highest dignity a primate, who does not shrink from the responsibility of plainly declaring his opinion of the heresies of this daring sceptic.* If we believe the scriptures, we cannot doubt that the sentence of excommunication was most justly pronounced, and that according to our Articles, he who calls himself Bishop of Natal, in reliance upon Royal Letters Patent, "ought, nevertheless, to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an heathen and publican," so that "he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." I have not yet received an official copy of the sentence, and therefore I have not formally published it, but it is a matter of such notoriety, and the published reports are so reliable, that I have no hesitation

* Since the delivery of this Charge, the Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking of the decision of the Committee of Council, is reported to have said:

"Of course the power given by the patents was null and void; but in no part of the judgment do they refer to the spiritual pastoral authority of the Bishops: that is left entirely free. That there should be any branch of the Catholic Church without a power of discipline, seems to be an anomaly unheard of. The power of discipline is inherent in every branch of the Catholic Church, and inalienable. To suppose any branch of that Church to exist without the power of deposing a heretical Bishop seems impossible. It is inconsistent alike with Scripture and History."